

REV. NETTLES REPLIES.

Issues Statement in Regard to Trial and Conviction at Recent Methodist Conference.

Editor The Herald and News:

In order to protect his good name before the people of South Carolina and to stop the tongue of slander, Rev. S. A. Nettles deems it necessary to present the facts with regard to his trial to the public.

He was found guilty of immorality by the committee appointed to try the case. Immorality in church law means "any crime expressly forbidden in the word of God." These are the words of the Manual of Discipline. Mr. Nettles denied before the committee, and he denies now, that he has been guilty of any immorality in the entire course of his ministry. His purpose in this statement is to acquaint the people of South Carolina with the facts brought out at the trial, in order that they may decide for themselves the proper conclusion to be drawn from them.

The charges preferred against Mr. Nettles were two: First, immorality, and, second, improper temper, words and actions.

Under the charge of immorality there were four specifications as follows: (1) "Improper and ungentlemanly approaches to (a young woman) in his office in Spartanburg, South Carolina, on or about the last of July, 1912, she at that time being his bookkeeper." (2) "Use of profane language and an assault upon R. D. Blowers, of Spartanburg, South Carolina, about the first of the year 1912." (3) "An assault upon J. B. Chick, student of Wofford college and local preacher in our church, on or about the 19th of May, 1913." (4) "Falsehood in statements made to Rev. A. N. Brunson on or about the first of May, 1913; Rev. M. W. Hook on or about the first of June, 1913; and Rev. W. A. Massebeau on or about the last of May, 1913."

There were two specifications under the second charge as follows: (1) "All of the specifications enumerated in the complaint of immorality." (2) "Treating creditors unpleasantly or abruptly and an unwillingness to meet honest obligations until forced to pay same by legal procedure."

With regard to the 2nd charge, the president of the committee of trial, in effect, told the committee that under the rulings of Bishop Wilson both specifications of the charge of "improper temper, words and actions" should be stricken out. The committee did strike out the second specification, but refused to strike out the first, and found Mr. Nettles guilty of "improper temper, words and actions". The church court of appeals will be asked to pass upon this, as well as their verdict on the charge of immorality.

The "improper and ungentlemanly approaches" to the lady as charged in the first specification under the head of immorality consisted in the fact that Mr. Nettles had kissed her on one occasion. She is a lady of unquestioned character. Mr. Nettles admitted that he had done so, but denied that there was any immorality in the act, and the committee of trial said his act was not immoral. Mr. Nettles is not a married man.

Mr. Nettles admitted that he slapped the face of R. D. Blowers, following an insult, and the committee found him guiltless of immorality on that score.

The prosecution offered no testimony upon the J. B. Chick matter. Mr. Nettles admits that he slapped Chick's face, because Chick used insulting language about his brother.

The only charge of immorality of which the committee of trial convicted Mr. Nettles was the charge relating to falsehood in statements. It was alleged that Mr. Nettles told a falsehood with reference to one, or both, of two conversations, as will appear more fully hereinafter.

One of the conversations took place in Spartanburg between Mr. J. B. Carlisle and Mr. Nettles. Mr. Nettles wrote Rev. W. A. Massebeau a letter with reference to that conversation, and it is on this letter that a charge of falsehood was based. The letter reads as follows:

"I wish you could have been with me last Thursday and heard a conversation with Brother J. B. Carlisle. The Cauthen petition was exactly as I surmised. He carried it around himself. Brother Carlisle told me that when he presented it to him he declined to sign it, whereupon Brother Cauthen asked him to read it and stated to him that it was intended largely for my vindication. He also told him he had carried it to Wright Nash, who had modified it somewhat so that there could be no objection to any one signing it. Carlisle told Cauthen he knew nothing against me."

"This letter is not private and you may make whatever use of it you think proper."

As Mr. Nettles stated on the witness stand, the petition mentioned in the above letter was "adroitly worded", and its evident purpose was to cause the board of managers to refuse to re-elect Mr. Nettles to the editorship of the Advocate.

Rev. A. J. Cauthen took the stand to prove that a falsehood was contained in the above letter, which will hereafter be referred to as the Massebeau letter. On direct examination he testified as follows:

Q. Did you, or did you not, present this petition to Mr. J. B. Carlisle?

A. I did.

Q. What influence caused him to sign it, if any?

A. His own free will.

Q. For what purpose did you tell Mr. Carlisle this petition was intended?

A. I did not tell him that it was intended for anything.

Q. You merely handed the petition to him to read?

A. I handed him the petition to read.

Q. What did he do?

A. He read it.

Q. How long afterward before he signed it?

A. Two or three minutes. Almost immediately.

Q. He did not demur?

A. A little later counsel for the prosecution read the Massebeau letter to Mr. Cauthen:

Q. I read this letter this morning, but I wish to read the statement in it so as to get the statement of the witness. Brother Cauthen, you can look at the paper; read it carefully for yourself, after I have read it in the hearing of the committee. Is that statement true?

A. You will have to put the question in a different form. If you will read it sentence by sentence I can answer it.

Q. If I take it sentence by sentence it may be too small to break it, but I will do it. "He carried it around himself?"

A. That is true.

Q. I read this sentence: "He carried it around himself?" Is that true?

A. It is.

Q. Note this sentence: "Brother Carlisle told me when he presented it to him he declined to sign it whereupon Brother Cauthen asked him to read it, and stated to him that it was intended largely for my vindication." Is that true?

A. It is not.

Q. Now the following sentence: "He also told him he had carried it to Wright Nash who had modified it somewhat so that there could be no objection to any one signing it."

A. That is true. I want to explain however. The petition as it was first formed was drafted by me on a piece of paper after the agreement that I referred to this evening and submitted to Mr. Nash as the attorney and as the chairman of the board of stewards of Central church for censorship. He changed one or two words, and it was re-written and that was the basis of the petition.

Q. Now this sentence, "Mr. Carlisle told Cauthen he knew nothing whatever against me." Is that true?

A. Mr. Carlisle said he knew nothing personal against Mr. Nettles.

On cross examination, counsel for Mr. Nettles developed the following illuminating statements from Mr. Cauthen:

Q. Why Brother Cauthen, did you think it necessary to explain to Mr. Carlisle why Mr. Nash had modified?

A. When Mr. Carlisle said he knew nothing personal against Mr. Nettles, I simply said you need not sign it if you do not wish. I see no difficulty in signing this paper because there is no possibility of being misunderstood by any one, but I want no one to sign it who does not do so of free and cheerful will, and Mr. Nash had modified the transcript so that it could not affect anyone.

Q. Did you not, Brother Cauthen, in this conversation with Mr. J. B. Carlisle say to him that the paper was intended for Mr. Nettles' vindication?

A. I did not, for the reason that there was no need to say it because the paper was there which stood for itself and the paper stated that it was as much for Mr. Nettles' vindication if he was innocent as it was to protect the church. That, however, was after Mr. Carlisle had signed the paper, and he and Mr. Gilmore were with me discussing the situation.

Mr. Nettles also had a conversation with Rev. M. W. Hook with regard to his talk with Mr. Carlisle. A letter from Mr. Hook to Mr. Cauthen was put in evidence. That letter is not now at hand. But in it Mr. Hook related what he said was the substance of a conversation with Mr. Nettles with regard to Mr. Nettles' conversation with Mr. J. B. Carlisle. The statements in that letter agreed with the statements in the Massebeau letter except that Mr. Hook used the word "deception" in relating what Mr. Nettles had said about the efforts of Mr. Cauthen to get signatures to the Cauthen petition. Mr. Nettles denied that he had used the word "deception". The Hook letter was written two months after the conversation between Mr. Hook and Mr. Nettles. Nothing but the signature is in the handwriting of Mr. Hook.

It was not learned who wrote it, but at least two other statements admitted in evidence were written by Mr. Cauthen, except for the signatures. Of all the written statements admitted in evidence against Mr. Nettles, not a single one was sworn to, nor did any one attempt to testify that they knew they were genuine except as to the signature of Mr. Hook. So that the defense had no opportunity to cross-examine the parties from whom these unsworn statements came.

The prosecution declined to call Mr. J. B. Carlisle as a witness, in spite of the fact that his name was put down in the charges as one of their witnesses, but contented themselves with a statement signed by the parties who had signed the Cauthen petition to the effect that no undue influence had been exerted to get them to sign it. Mr. Nettles knows and respects Mr. Carlisle, as a man of strength of character and purpose, and he has never represented that Mr. Carlisle was a weak-minded man who could be unduly influenced.

Mr. Nettles had the president of the committee of trial to summon Mr. Carlisle for the defense by telegraph, but he replied that he was sick and could not come. Mr. Nettles wanted a commission sent immediately to take his deposition, but owing to the fact that Mr. Cauthen's own testimony, as above quoted, corroborated and established the essential truth of the Massebeau letter he deemed it useless, particularly in view of the fact that it would have delayed the trial and the adjournment of the annual conference while the deposition was being taken in Spartanburg.

Fair-minded and unprejudiced people can decide for themselves from the above whether Mr. Nettles lied in the letter he wrote to Mr. Massebeau.

The other falsehood charged against Mr. Nettles was developed by the prosecution in this wise: Rev. A. N. Brunson testified that on the Thursday night of the district conference at Dillon (it was in May, 1913) he rode a short distance in an automobile with Mr. Nettles, and in course of conversation Mr. Nettles said: "I have seen Howard and he endorses me and says that Bethel church is back of me."

This Howard is Mr. M. W. Howard, a shoe drummer, who lives in Spartan-

burg and is a member of Bethel church. Mr. Nettles recalled the ride with Mr. Brunson, but could not answer yea or nay as to whether he had made the statement above quoted, because he did not recall just what he had said to Mr. Brunson.

Mr. Howard was then put up to swear "whether or not you made this statement". His first answer was, "most emphatically No, sir. I have not seen Brother Nettles or had any talk with him concerning his election". But on cross examination his testimony lost its emphasis. Counsel asked him this question: "Were you not, after the close of the conference in Anderson, in the town of Belton, and did you not at the depot converse with Mr. Nettles?" His reply was: "I do not remember". Then he proceeded to make this admission: "We conversed on the train coming from Anderson to Greenville". Before he left the stand he said this: "I have no recollection of discussing the Advocate with him at all".

Mr. Nettles testified that he recalled talking with Mr. Howard coming from Anderson to Greenville immediately after the annual conference of 1912, but he had no recollection of what was said, but he was sure of this: That if he told Mr. Brunson that Howard said he endorsed him and that Bethel church would stand back of him, Howard had said it. Scores of people on that train that day had congratulated Mr. Nettles on the vote of hearty endorsement the annual conference gave him, and it would have been, indeed, strange if Mr. Howard had ridden with him and had not made some pleasant allusion to the fact. Mr. Howard had been president of the State Epworth League and as such had been a frequent visitor to the Advocate office. There had been no unpleasantness between him and Mr. Nettles, nor had he ever intimated to Mr. Nettles that he did not like him as editor. On the contrary, he had, by his conduct on many occasions, led Mr. Nettles to believe that he was friendly toward him.

Mr. Howard was as hazy as to that conversation on the train as Mr. Nettles was, for Mr. Howard admitted as he left the stand: "I have no recollection of discussing the Advocate with him at all" (that day on the train).

The above is the meat of the testimony on the charge of immorality. Upon it, the committee of trial convicted Mr. Nettles of falsehood, and consequently, found him guilty of immorality. Let the people who read this come to their own conclusion. All Mr. Nettles asks is that the good people of South Carolina, whom he has lived among for fifty-five years, shall base their opinion of his veracity upon facts. If Mr. Nettles is not a truthful man, he ought to be expelled from the ministry. Yet the committee of trial only suspended him for three months.

Rev. Preston B. Wells and Rev. A. R. Phillips refused to sign the verdict of guilty.

S. A. Nettles.

Rev. A. J. Cauthen.

When Mr. Nettles first heard of the vindictive efforts being made by Rev. A. J. Cauthen to get him out of the editorship of the Advocate, he felt that it was a matter to be threshed out in these columns and brought to a conclusion. He knew, what every Methodist in South Carolina knows, that the editors of the Advocate have usually been objects of envy and the storm-centers of attack. And Mr. Nettles was not afraid of the storm. Detrimental rumors were emanating from Spartanburg, some of them absolutely false and slanderous, and all of them vilely perverted and exaggerated. Mr. Nettles felt that they would hurt the church, he being editor of the church organ, and for that reason wanted to challenge all parties to enter the columns of this paper and let the truth be established.

But several of our most prominent ministers protested strongly against this when Mr. Nettles spoke to them of his intention. They took the position that it would stir up controversy and cause dissension in the church. So Mr. Nettles yielded to their advice.

But Mr. Nettles has borne long enough in silence. He has some rights in the matter, and he intends to assert them. Furthermore, he believes that the time has fully come when outspokenness is better than silence.

At the annual conference held in Anderson in November, 1912, Mr. Cauthen made a strenuous effort to oust Mr. Nettles from the editorship of the Advocate. He may seek by words to cover up his purpose, but the members of the conference and the bishop who presided all understood such to have been his purpose. Mr. Cauthen was signally defeated, and it apparently irked him. Then he went back to Spartanburg and rumors began to circulate. Mr. Nettles was charged with all sorts of offenses, according to these rumors emanating from Spartanburg. Every time Mr. Nettles heard of them Mr. Cauthen's name was linked with them. Mr. Cauthen discussed these rumors with many people, but never took the trouble—as a man and a Christian minister—to speak to Mr. Nettles about them. He carried a petition around asking people to sign it, which petition was addressed to the board that elects the editor of the Advocate, and which was intended to prevent or forestall the election of Mr. Nettles. He wrote to a prominent bank official in Spartanburg, saying that he understood he

(Continued on page seven.)

SALE PERSONAL PROPERTY.

Notice is hereby given that we, as administrators of Capt. H. H. Folk, deceased, will sell at his late residence at 11 o'clock in the forenoon on December 17, 1913, the following personal property, of which the said deceased died seized and possessed.

Five wagons, six mules, farm implements and other personal property of said deceased.

Terms of sale cash.

C. M. Folk,

T. W. Folk,

Administrators.

12-2-13

Direct From the Distillers

HERE ARE THE Brands and Prices

Twenty years of business and no dissatisfied customers. We know good whiskey. We ship no other kind. With every package is our guarantee. Every bottle up to Government standards.

My! My! Look at These Prices

Brands of Goods—Express Collect.

CORN	4-Qts.	1 Gal.
No. 1 Star Corn	\$1.60	\$1.50
No. 2 Star Corn	1.80	1.70
No. 3 Star Corn	1.90	1.80
No. 4 Star Corn	2.00	1.90
No. 5 Star Corn	2.30	2.20
No. 6 Star Corn	2.70	2.60

RYE	4-Qts.	1 Gal.
No. 1 Star Rye	\$1.60	\$1.50
No. 2 Star Rye	1.80	1.70
No. 3 Star Rye	1.90	1.80
No. 4 Star Rye	2.00	1.90
No. 5 Star Rye	2.30	2.20
No. 6 Star Rye	2.70	2.60

Brands of Goods, Express Prepaid

CORN	8 Qts.	2 Gals.
No. 1 Star Corn	\$3.70	\$3.50
No. 2 Star Corn	4.00	3.80
No. 3 Star Corn	4.30	4.10
No. 4 Star Corn	4.50	4.30
No. 5 Star Corn	5.20	5.00
No. 6 Star Corn	5.90	5.70

RYE	8 Qts.	2 Gals.
No. 1 Star Rye	\$3.70	\$3.50
No. 2 Star Rye	4.00	3.80
No. 3 Star Rye	4.30	4.10
No. 4 Star Rye	4.50	4.30
No. 5 Star Rye	5.20	5.00
No. 6 Star Rye	5.90	5.70

And Here's a Special—Grab It Quick.

1 Gallon, 100 proof Corn, Express Prepaid \$2.30

2 Gallons, 100 proof Corn, Express Prepaid \$4.00

You won't get better whiskey anywhere.

The prices speak for themselves. Careful attention given to all orders.

"The Greatest Cut Price Mail Order House."

The National Whiskey Co.

DISTILLERS

P. O. Box 206

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

NOTICE OF FINAL SETTLEMENT.

I will make a final settlement in Probate Court for Newberry county, on December 22nd, 1913, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon as administrator of the estate of S. M. Johnson, deceased and will immediately thereafter apply for discharge as administrator. Any person having claims against said estate will present them duly attested, on or before that day.

E. C. Johnson,
Administrator.

November 20th, 1913.

NOTICE OF FINAL SETTLEMENT.

I will make a final settlement in Probate Court for Newberry county, on December 19th, 1913, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon as administratrix of the estate of Rebecca I. Thompson, deceased and will immediately thereafter apply for discharge as administratrix. Any person having claims against said estate will present them duly attested, on or before that day.

Maggie L. Livingstone,
Administratrix.

CAN'T LOSE HAIR.

Twenty Years From Today a Bald-headed Man Will be an Unusual Sight.

One of the most prominent druggists of America made a statement a few weeks ago which has caused a great deal of discussion among scientists in the medical press.

He said: "If the new hair grower, Mildredina Hair Remedy, increases its sales as it has during the past year, it will be used by nearly every man, woman and child in America within eight years."

When Mildredina Hair Remedy is used almost universally, dandruff will disappear and with its departure baldness, itching scalp, splitting hair and all scalp diseases will follow and twenty years from now a bald head will be a rarity."

There is only one way to cure dandruff, and that is to kill the germs. There is only one hair preparation that will kill the germs and that is Mildredina Hair Remedy. This unusual hair restorer with its record of thousands of cures will grow hair on any head where there is any life left; it will cure dandruff, stop falling out hair and itching of the scalp in three weeks or money back.

It is the most pleasant and invigor-

ating tonic, is not sticky, or greasy and is used extensively by ladies of refinement who desire to have and to keep their hair soft, lustrous and luxuriant. Fifty cents for a large bottle druggists everywhere. Mail orders filled by American Proprietary Co., Boston, Mass. 11-11-4t.

Worthen's Wonder Workers

The Great Nerve and Brain Food.

Highly recommended for Nervous Debility, Nervous Prostration, Decline of Strength, Loss of Ambition, Insomnia, Melancholy, Nervous Dyspepsia, Kidney and Bladder Trouble and Constipation.

WORTHEN'S WONDER WORKERS are the greatest Laxative Tonic Tablet in the world.

ONE MONTH'S TREATMENT FOR \$1.90.

GUARANTEED—We will send six boxes of Worthen's Wonder Workers to you for \$5.00, and guarantee them to give satisfaction or return the money.

Price \$1.00 a box 6 boxes \$5.00.

Sent by Mail on receipt of price.

GAINS 40 POUNDS IN 40 DAYS.

Remarkable Results of The New Tissue Builder Tonic Tablets in Many Cases of Run-Down Men and Women.

Prove it yourself by buying a box of Tonic Tablets now.

"By George, I never saw anything like the effects of that new treatment, Tonic Tablets, for building up of weight and lost nerve force. It acted more like a miracle than a medicine," said a well-known gentleman yesterday in speaking of the revolution that had taken place in his condition. "I began to think that there was nothing on earth that could make me fat. I tried tonics, digestives, heavy eating, diets, milk, beer and almost everything else you could think of, but without result."

Any man or woman who is thin can recover normal weight by the best new treatment Tonic Tablets. "I have been thin for years and began to think it was natural for me to be that way. Finally I read about the remarkable processes brought about by use of Tonic Tablets, so I decided to try myself. Well, when I look at myself in the mirror now, I think it is somebody else, I have put

on just forty pounds during the last forty days, and never felt stronger or more 'nervy' in my life."

Toneline Tabs are a powerful inducer to nutrition, increases cell-growth, food, increases the number of blood-corpuscles and as a necessary result builds up muscles, and solid healthy flesh, and rounds out the figure.

For women who can never appear stylish in anything they wear because of their thinness this remarkable treatment may prove a revelation. It is a beauty maker as well as a form builder and nerve strengthener. Toneline Tabs cost \$1 for a 50-days' treatment, at druggists, or mailed by American Proprietary Co., Boston, Mass.

In a Few Days Backache And Kidney Misery Vanish.

Your out-of-order kidneys will act fine, ending most severe bladder trouble. No man or woman here whose kidneys are out of order, or who suffer from backache or bladder misery, can afford to leave Bloodline Blood and Kidney Tablets untried.

After taking several doses, all pains in the back, sides or loins, rheumatic sleeplessness, inflamed or swollen eyelids, dizziness, tired or worn-out clogged, sluggish kidneys simply vanish.

Uncontrollable urination (especially at night), smarting, discolored water and all bladder misery ends. The moment you suspect the slightest kidney or bladder disorder or feel rheumatic pains, don't continue to be miserable or worried, but get a fifty-cent treatment of Bloodline Blood and Kidney Tablets from your druggist and start taking as directed, with the knowledge that there is no other medicine at any price, made anywhere else in the world, which is so harmless or will effect so thorough and prompt a cure.

This unusual preparation goes direct to the cause of trouble, distributing the cleansing, healing and vitalizing influence directly upon the organs and glands affected, and completes the cure before you realize it.

A few days' treatment of Bloodline Blood and Kidney Tablets means clean, healthy, active kidneys, bladder, and urinary organs—and you feel fine. Accept only Bloodline Blood and Kidney Tablets—fifty-cents and \$1.00 box. American Proprietary Co., Boston, Mass. 11-11-4t 11aw.